

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Alexander C. Ekstrom
Richland

**USA v. ANGELA MADRIGAL
CHAVEZ**

Case No. 4:22-CR-6041-MKD-3

Richland Video Conference (ACE @ Yakima; Defendant @ Richland)
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

Detention Hearing:

12/14/2022

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pam Howard, Courtroom Deputy [Y]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Gore, Courtroom Deputy [R]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services [Y]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM [R] <input type="checkbox"/> out of custody | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Burson, US Atty [Y]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Robin Emmans, Defense Atty (video)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter – Natalia Rivera [Y]
<input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear |
|--|--|
-
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of Release imposed
<input type="checkbox"/> 199C Advice of Penalties/Sanctions |
|--|---|

REMARKS

USA proffered the pretrial services report and the supplemental pretrial services report and does not concur with its recommendation of Defendant's release.

USA advised the Court as to the facts pertaining to the investigation of this Defendant and the nature of the offense.

USA argues Defendant is not here legally and has ties to Mexico. USA argues Defendant has criminal history and has demonstrated her willingness to evade deportation and arrest.

Court colloquy with Defense regarding receipt of discovery USA just proffered. Defense advised she had received a link but not had a chance to review it due to being out of town with a family emergency.

Defense argued Defendant has strong ties to this community and has health issues that put her at risk of contracting COVID and has carpal tunnel issues that requires possible surgery with follow up care. Defense advised the posting of a financial bond would hamper Defendant's quick release and her medical care that she was in the process of obtaining.

Defense counsel argued why the Defendant should be released.

The Court ordered:

1. USA's Motion for Detention is **granted**; subject to right to return before the Court should circumstances change.
2. That there is no combination of conditions to ensure that Defendant is not a danger to the community.
Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.